

**REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of this application. Claims 1-16 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, and 16 have been amended. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 14 and 15 in the Office Action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for lacking antecedent basis for “said cast.” Claim 8 has been amended to remove the recitation of “said cast.” Therefore, the Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,592,205 to Beerling (“Beerling”). Claim 1 is the independent claim. The Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Beerling does not disclose “wherein each of said chambers defines a flat bottom wall and an opposed dome-shaped upper wall, the dome-shaped upper wall defining a perimeter continuously joined to said flat bottom wall,” as recited by claim 1. The Office Action aligns the

second surface 613 of Beerling's Fig. 6 with the claimed "flat bottom wall," and apparently aligns the ink feed channel 413 of Beerling's Fig. 6 with the claimed "upper wall." However, the ink feed channel 413 is not "opposed" to the second surface 613, as claimed, nor is it "dome-shaped," as also claimed. (See Beerling at Fig. 6.) Moreover, the ink feed channel 413 does not "defin[e] a perimeter continuously joined to" the second surface 613. Rather, as shown in Beerling's Fig. 6, the perimeter of ink feed channel 413 (near wetting metals 609) is completely disjoined from the second surface 613. In view of the foregoing, Beerling does not disclose "wherein each of said chambers defines a flat bottom wall and an opposed dome-shaped upper wall, the dome-shaped upper wall defining a perimeter continuously joined to said flat bottom wall," as recited by claim 1.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1, and are patentable over Beerling for at least the same reasons.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

(1) The Office Action rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Beerling in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,733,433 to Lee et al. ("Lee"). Claims 10 and 11 depend variously from claim 1, which, as demonstrated above, is patentable over Beerling. Lee does not remedy the deficiencies of Beerling. Accordingly, claim 1, as well as dependent claims 10 and 11, are patentable over any reasonable combination of Beerling and Lee.

(2) The Office Action rejected claims 12, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,315,393 to Van Nice et al. ("Van Nice"). Claims

12 and 16 are the independent claims. The Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

*First*, no reasonable combination of Lee and Van Nice discloses or renders obvious, “performing an electrodeposition of a metal on said layer of gold to make a sacrificial layer, obtained from a controlled and non-contained growth parallel and perpendicular to said layer of gold,” as recited by claims 12 and 16. The Office Action asserts that Lee discloses this step at column 7, lines 15-25. However, nowhere does Lee disclose that the sacrificial material pattern 35 is “obtained from a controlled and *non-contained* growth,” as claimed (emphasis added). Rather, the sacrificial material pattern 35 is obtained by using a mask for limiting electrodeposition. (See Lee at col. 7, ll. 14-15.) Van Nice does not provide the missing disclosure. Accordingly, no reasonable combination of Lee and Van Nice discloses or renders obvious, “performing an electrodeposition of a metal on said layer of gold to make a sacrificial layer, obtained from a controlled and non-contained growth parallel and perpendicular to said layer of gold,” as recited by claims 12 and 16.

*Second*, no reasonable combination of Lee and Van Nice discloses or renders obvious, “wherein each of the chambers defines a flat bottom wall and an opposed dome-shaped upper wall, the dome-shaped upper wall defining a perimeter continuously joined to the flat bottom wall,” as recited by claims 12 and 16. The Office Action apparently aligns the micro-chambers 40 of Lee’s FIG. 4J with the claimed “chambers.” However, the micro-chambers 40 do not “define[] a flat bottom wall and an opposed dome-shaped upper wall, the dome-shaped upper wall defining a perimeter continuously joined to the flat bottom wall,” as claimed. Rather, as

shown in Lee's FIG. 4J, the micro-chambers 40 are substantially rectangular in shape, with a flat upper wall. Van Nice does not provide the missing disclosure. Accordingly, no reasonable combination of Lee and Van Nice discloses or renders obvious, "wherein each of the chambers defines a flat bottom wall and an opposed dome-shaped upper wall, the dome-shaped upper wall defining a perimeter continuously joined to the flat bottom wall," as recited by claims 12 and 16.

The Applicant submits that claims 12 and 16 are patentable over any reasonable combination of Lee and Van Nice for at least the foregoing two reasons. Claim 13 depends from claim 12, and is patentable for at least the same reasons.

### **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Applicant: Lucia Giovanola  
Appl. No.: 10/538,743

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 7, 2008

/Steven J. Schwarz/

---

Steven J. Schwarz  
Registration No. 47,070  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-4000  
Direct Dial: (202) 344-4295  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

#995533